

Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME III.]

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1858.

[NUMBER 8.

The Radical Abolitionist

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BECKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	6.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

Tobitt's Combination-Type, 181 William-street.

ANTI-SLAVERY AT THE SOUTH, REPROVING "REPUBLICAN" COMPROMISE AT THE NORTH.

We cannot say that the Anti slavery sentiment beginning to be manifested in Missouri, or even in Kentucky, is of so high a moral and political tone as it ought to be. We think it is not. But from the following, it would appear that it embodies earnestness and sagacity enough to repudiate and rebuke the disclaimers of Northern Republicans of any desire to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists! What good could such helpers do to the cause of freedom at the South?

A VOICE FROM MISSOURI.

From the Missouri Democrat.

"Among the signs of the times are expressions recently uttered by Republican Members on the floor of the Senate, which we do not feel at liberty to pass without notice. Mr. Seward has stated that he regards the great battle between Freedom and Slavery as 'over,' inasmuch as, before one year passes away, the free States will be to the Slave as nineteen to fifteen. This has been followed by a remark from Mr. Fessenden expressly disavowing any intention or desire to interfere with Slavery in the States where it now exists, and others have asserted the same thing in language equally as broad. It is with deep regret we chronicle the use of such terms by men in whose public conduct we have seen much to admire heretofore, and we must deplore the tendency which betrays itself in certain quarters to give so great a cause a purely sectional aspect. If Mr. Seward wishes only a preponderance of Northern States in the confederacy, he may well say the battle is over; and if Mr. Fessenden desires to confine the benefits of free white labor to the section it now holds, he may well say that he does not intend to interfere with Slavery in the Slave States; but all must see that such positions, whether so intended or not, are sectional, selfish, and recreant to human progress. Partisans and placemen may be content to wear the honors they have won, but the people will not rest satisfied with the delights of any such Capua. To-day we are struggling here in Missouri, a present Slave State, to give all its valleys to cultivation by free white citizens, relieved from slavery competition, and we are told that such effort meets no indorsement at the hands of men who have heretofore held to a broad faith in the progress of free institutions. Very well, let it be so. We shall go forward, nevertheless, and may say with Nelson, when slighted by admiralty despatches, 'some day we shall have a gazette of our own.' We are struggling now and here, not for theoretic preponderance of Free States in the Federal Government, not for mere Territorial

liberties to guarantee free labor expansion, but also to reclaim Missouri from the disadvantages of a slave system that is paralyzing her energies and crippling her advance. And we make bold to say, furthermore, that our sympathy and our service are not confined within the line that separates our State from adjacent States; but that all efforts to confer like benefit upon other commonwealths—to elevate and encourage and protect the labor of the free working citizens against the depression of servile toil, will ever meet with our zealous co-operation. In Kentucky, in Tennessee, in Va., Maryland, the same movement in behalf of free soil for the free labor of a free yeomanry is transpiring, and we hail it with emphatic congratulation. We know that it will be said in vindication of the positions assumed by Senators, that Congress and the Federal Government have no right to interfere in such work, and that the Republican party has no mission to constrain the expansion of free principles in Slave States. This in part is true, but it does not fully meet the case. Practically, Congress is determining now the existence or non-existence of Slavery in Kansas, under the shadow of a dominant party, of an Administration and of a Supreme Court that do not recognize the power of Congress over the question of Slavery in the Territories. It is the influence, the patronage, the moral weight, the protection of the Federal Government that affects the subject even in the absence of direct intervention. It has been so in Kansas; it is so in Missouri. All these are now thrown into the scale against free labor and for slave labor. Moreover, it is the roll of political organizations, national and otherwise, to formulate distinct policies, to give momentum to great truths, to achieve victories everywhere in behalf of the right. To this end the extinction of Slavery in the central grain growing Slave States is one of the first steps in the path of progress—a step that is to be accomplished through the instrumentality of their own swelling populations doing the work, as is now being done in the territories and elsewhere, and sustained in so doing by an embodied public sentiment throughout the nation, call it party or whatever name suits, that will cheer or uphold their self-advancement. It is idle for leaders, in their isolation, to ignore such manifest outgrowths. The shoots show forth the vital sap in the trunk. Whether, therefore, present organizations may see fit to accept the appointed mission of cherishing free principles, extending a protecting ægis over free emigration, and vindicating the cause of free labor everywhere, as it moves from clime to clime, is a matter of small consequence; for the masses of the people of the United States will not long want combination, expressive of these great ends, whenever the same becomes needful. It is moreover thus, and thus only, that a true nationality will take the place of mere sectionalism, for it transfers the strife from a conflict between States to contest for populations. It substitutes physical development, social elevation, and home aggrandizement, for the issues of prejudice, repression and disunion which now obtain. It subordinates the Slavery question to the popular will, and makes appeal to that will a legitimate field of controversy. The Free-Labor movement, as it has taken body and shape and form out of the late Territorial and incipient State struggles, as it has found its development in thickening settlement, as it has gathered in its hand the aspirations of the heroic, the hopes of the economic, the devotions of the fanatical and the calculations of the speculative, as it has manipulated the tide of streaming thousands who pour forth from their hive, and directed it here or there, so it will dominate the future of politics in despite of all opposition. Those who are with it may guide it to beneficent ends, and cheer the heart of patriotism with its miracles and its gospels; those who are not with it will be crushed beneath its momentum, and left

upon the shore as bleaching wrecks to mark a foolish anchorage.

Let us hope that the words we have commented upon are hasty expressions which the speakers, seeing the attitude they place themselves in, will be the first to retract or explain. If not, we shall write with deep regret their withdrawal from the coming field of future victory, but no abandonment by parties or politicians shall induce us to trail the banner that has been unfurled in this State until Missouri shall be possessed in fulness and entirely by free white labor."

But this editorial of the True Democrat is not the first, nor the earliest indication on the part of Missouri anti-slavery men, to rise above the platform of Northern "Republicans." In a speech delivered in the Hall of the Missouri House of Representatives, in Jefferson City, some time since, JAMES B. GARDENSHIRE Esq., President of the Jefferson City Land Company, distinctly affirmed that "Slavery exists by force, and not by law," and cited Chief Justice Marshall as authority for the statement.

More recently, (January 14,) Hon. FRANCIS P. BLAIR, JR., of Missouri, Member of Congress, offered and advocated, in the House of Representatives of the United States, a resolution for the appointment of a Committee to consider and report upon the expediency of providing for the acquisition of a Territory in Central or South America, to be colonized with the slaves to be emancipated in Missouri. Thus plainly involving the principle of Congressional interference with Slavery in a Slave State; and that too, in advance of any action of the Legislature of Missouri, and without any reference to any anticipated action from that quarter. With the principle or the policy of colonizing the colored people, we have no fellowship or co-operation, nor do we believe that it will ever prevail in any State now holding slaves, when its slavery shall cease. But the principle and the practice of invoking National interference with State slavery, and without State action, is already proclaimed and inaugurated in Congress by this motion and speech of Mr. Blair. This will appear from the resolution itself, which tells its own story.

Resolved, That a select committee to consist of—members, be appointed by the Speaker, with instructions to inquire into the expediency of providing for the acquisition of territory either in the Central or South American States, to be colonized with colored persons from the United States, who are now free, or who may hereafter become free, and who may be willing to settle in such territory as a dependency of the United States, with ample guaranties of their personal and political rights.

Washington Globe.

Mr. Blair advocated this Resolution in a Speech of great length. He did so, not as an agent for the Legislature or the State of Missouri, but only as a Representative, directly, of a locality, St. Louis and vicinity; indirectly, of a minority of the voters of Missouri—a long stride towards invoking the Federal Guaranty, to every State in this Union, of a Republican form of Government. Just ponder the proposal for 'ample guaranties to the negroes, of their personal and political rights.' And then look forward to the application of the emancipated colored Central Americans to be admitted into the Union, under this guaranty—'The world does move.'

ms. of Charles

A VOICE FROM KENTUCKY.

From the Kentucky Weekly News.

FREEDOM IN SLAVE STATES.—"I am very sorry that the faith of the honorable Senator from New Hampshire is less than my own. He apprehends continual disaster. He wants this battle continued and fought by skirmishes, and to deprive the enemy of every kind of supplies. Sir, I regard this battle as already fought; it is over. All the mistake is that the honorable Senator and others does not know it. We are fighting for a majority of free States. There are already sixteen to fifteen; and whatever the Administration may do—whatever anybody may do—before one year from this time we shall be nineteen to fifteen."—[W. H. Seward.]

The skirmish which took place a short time since, in the United States Senate, between Mr. Seward of New York and Mr. Hale of New Hampshire, has been viewed with a degree of surprise by others than ourselves. The above sentiment, coming as it does from one who has always been regarded as an able, candid and impartial statesman, causes us here in the South to pause and take a few moments' sober reflection. We are fully aware of the great bearing of the opinions of the honorable Senator, and of the effect they have on the public heart; yet, notwithstanding his usual good judgment, and the soundness of his far-reaching policy, we beg leave, with all deference to his superior wisdom and ability, to express our decided dissent from this emphatic declaration.

Following the above enunciation of Mr. Seward, comes a compliment from Mr. Fessenden of the remark of the former, and expressly disavowing any intention or desire to interfere with Slavery in the States where it now exists, and we regret to see that one or two others have taken the same position.*

After quoting from the preceding Editorial of the Missouri Democrat, the Weekly News proceeds:

"We should like to know what battle the honorable Senator from New York alludes to when he says: I regard the battle as already fought; it is over. Here in Kentucky the battle has just begun to be fought, and we are now engaged in the hazardous task of persuading the 'white slaves' to wake up to a true sense of the degraded position in which the system of Slavery places them. We wish to stimulate to a degree of independence, and induce them to throw off the shackles which, for over a century, has bound them down in a position more servile, and are themselves even more subservient to the rule of barbarism, and despotism, than the African slave, who trembles under the lash of his master. Such is the mission in which we are engaged here at the South, and we are told that our efforts meet with no approval at the hands of men who have heretofore held the broad faith that, no stone shall be left unturned until the cause of freedom 'shall be proclaimed throughout all the land, and unto all the inhabitants thereof.' We are struggling now and here, not for theoretic preponderance of free States in the federal government nor for mere territorial liberties to guarantee free white labor expansion, but also to reclaim Kentucky from the disadvantages of a Slave system that is paralyzing her energies and crippling her advance. Let these Senators at the North say what they will, we shall not relax one jot in the true position which we have espoused until we have secured to our people the blessings of LIBERTY, nor will the demands of justice be satisfied with anything short of such a measure.

From the Kentucky News, we have, however, other, and earlier, and still more specific utterances of our own 'Radical' doctrines, which we have carefully laid aside, for publication as soon as we have room.

We cannot but hope that these earnest remonstrances from anti-slavery men in the South, will have a salutary influence upon Republican statesmen and editors, in the North.

The following remarks upon the article in the Missouri Democrat are from the New York TRIBUNE, into which that article was copied.

"We print in another column, and we recommend to the special attention of our readers, an article from *The Missouri Democrat*.

"It is not surprising if, just at this moment, when numerous indications concur to prove that Missouri is about to enter on a struggle to make herself a Free-labor State, the Free-labor men of Missouri should hear with

* The Kentucky News should have understood, that, with inconsiderable exceptions, this has been the 'Republican' position from the beginning, affirmed in its Pittsburgh platform—implied in its Philadelphia platform—expressed clearly by its Presidential Candidate—repeated by its orators and Editors during the Presidential campaign, and re-affirmed in Republican speeches during the last session of Congress.

some surprise and some dissatisfaction too, the announcement on the floor of Congress, from the lips of Senator Seward, that the great battle between Freedom and Slavery is over, and that, having secured a numerical majority in the Senate, the Free-labor States will have no further interest in that struggle; or from Senator Fessenden the declaration that the Republican party have no idea of helping and supporting those who may be struggling in behalf of Free-labor within the Slave States. The truth is, as the point is well put in the article to which we have referred, that this is no longer a matter as to which the Free-labor States have any choice. In the repeal of the Missouri Prohibition; in the Dred Scott decision; in the attempt now making in Kansas to force Slavery upon a reluctant and struggling population; in the new Southern doctrine that Slavery instead of being a curse is a blessing—the slaveholders have thrown down a gauntlet which the Free Laborers cannot but take up. The slaveholders have a party in every Free State of this Union—a party which they labor to strengthen and uphold, by employing the vast patronage of the Federal Government, now at their disposal, solely for that purpose. There are papers in this city which already more or less openly second the extreme Southern demand for a revival of the African slave trade. Not even a City or Ward election can take place; scarcely a school committee man or a constable can be chosen in the State of New York without raising the question whether or not the candidate is sound on the goose. Innovations commonly begin at the North, but in time they spread to the South. Hitherto the Free-labor party of the South has been kept entirely under by the same reign of terror which it was attempted to establish in Kansas. Such still continues to be the case in every Slave State, with the single exception of Missouri. But neither there nor in any other State in which a Free-labor party may organize itself, need any apprehension be felt of want of sympathy and efficient support from the Free-labor States of the Union."

Thus far, from the Tribune. The 'sympathy and support,' in order to be 'efficient,' must be commensurate with the exigencies of the case. As Slavery has its pledged partisans, North and South, Freedom must have the same. As the supporters of slavery, northern and southern, are laboring to carry the curse of slavery into the whole country 'under the Constitution,' so the friends of liberty must determine to carry 'the blessings of liberty' into the whole country 'under the Constitution.' Nothing short of this will rise above 'sectionalism,' or unite Northern and Southern men in opposing the Slave Power. Nothing short of this will inspire confidence, or courage, or enthusiasm. Mere 'Non-extension' cannot meet the wants, nor command the respect, of friends of freedom south of Mason and Dixon's line. 'Dissolution of the Union' can neither promise to them, nor expect from them, anything better. In either of these, Northern men only 'give the cold shoulder' to their Southern friends, and have no reason to expect anything better than the cold shoulder, in return. If we would have Southern helpers, we must offer to help the South. The vast majority of 'the South' are in favor of freedom;—hitherto, no Northern party, of any considerable numbers, have done otherwise than to overlook the majority of 'the South' in all their calculations.

A MATHEMATICAL IMPOSSIBILITY.

Mr. Madison, in No. 42 of the Federalist, labors to show the necessity of exchanging the 'Articles of Confederation,' then existing, for a National Government with more ample powers. He adverts to the disposition of some to claim a State Sovereignty, incompatible with any Sovereign authority in the Union. Having noticed a particular instance, in relation to "the regulation of Commerce with Indian tribes," he remarks:

"This is not the only case in which the Articles of Confederation have inconsiderately endeavored to accomplish impossibilities; to reconcile a partial Sovereignty in the Union, with a complete Sovereignty in the States; to subvert a mathematical axiom, by taking away a part, and letting the whole remain."

We commend the demonstration of Mr. Madison to the successors of his opponents.

THE BOTTOM LINE.

No National power to abolish National sin.—All Government an usurpation.—Authority of minorities to usurp and define their own powers.—Governments not bound by their own professions—nor by 'the higher law,' but only by the human sources of their authority—and when there is power to compel them.—Slaves not Federal Citizens.—National abolition despotic and anti-republican!

Our readers must have patience with us, and with our correspondent J. P. B. It is important to pursue discussions of controverted principles till we can ascertain the bottom line. Then, the principle is tested, and the distinction between truth and error made manifest.

We commenced this discussion, on the single point of Federal authority, under the Constitution, to abolish Slavery. Our Correspondent then agreed with us that Slavery cannot be legalized, and that no State or National Sovereignty can include the right to maintain Slavery. The reader will see on what ground he stands now.

For the Radical Abolitionist.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

In the Radical Abolitionist for January, (page 45) I notice a statement of questions from a correspondent at Hartford, Vt., introduced by an editorial invitation to give them attention; and the remark, that 'if any of those who deny the Constitutional authority of the Federal Government to abolish Slavery in the States,' &c. 'can reply to these questions, we should be glad to hear from them;' and at the close of the questions, I am also especially invited to examine them, by the writer. This double appeal leaves me no discretion; but renders it incumbent upon me, in honor, to give the answer so strongly solicited.

In doing this I find it necessary to restate the questions in full, with the answers—

Question 1. 'Is not Government a divine grant for the good of all the people?'

Answer. Government is not and never has been 'a divine grant' at all; it has ever been a usurpation of power by those who desire to govern, and assented to by the servility or fears of the governed. (1.) Its institution is not 'for the good of all the people,' but only for the good of that minor portion whose social position secures to them all its advantages, by the depression of the greater mass. (2.)

2. 'Have a portion of the people,' (a great majority, if you please,) any authority to frame, or administer a government for any other ends than those for which it is divinely ordained for the good of all?'

Omitting the words 'divinely ordained' as an error, and inserting in their place the word 'professed,' my answer is, that while no portion of the people, however large, have any rightful authority to institute any government, yet if they do, they are morally bound in justice, 'to frame or administer' such a one, as shall be for the good of all, to the extent of the power they grant to it. (3.)

3. 'Does not the Federal Constitution, in its very first sentence, recognise the higher law of justice and right, by proposing just such ends as a government guided by the higher law would pursue?'

I see in the Preamble of the Constitution no recognition of the 'higher law of justice and right' according to Christian interpretation. (4.) There is a proposal to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty, purposes which are professed by all the governments of the earth, even the most tyrannical. (5.) There is no acknowledgment of any obligation whatever, and the reason given for proposing these objects, is not because they are demanded by a higher law of justice and right, but 'in order to form a more perfect Union.' (6.) Governmental professions and recognitions without enactments, are never understood to give just claim to the power of executing them. (7.)

4. 'Since to regard the higher law is simply to regard right, will a government which does not regard the higher law, be bound by any law, or by a constitution?'

I do not know that I understand this question, nor do I see its bearing on any of the other questions. I can only answer it by saying, that a government is legally

bound by its Constitution, whether it regards the higher law or not. (8.)

5. 'If the Federal Government has not authority to administer impartial justice to all the people, in accordance with the higher law, from what source does it derive any authority at all?'

This question also perplexes me to discern its meaning as well as its object. I cannot understand how the authority of the Federal Government, 'to administer impartial justice to all the people,' affects the question of the source from whence it derives its authority. (9.) It derives its legal authority from the grants of power from the States or the people, expressed in the Constitution, whatever that expression may be, as to impartial justice. (10.)

6. 'Admitting that the Federal Constitution is not a rule of government prescribed by the people, but simply an instrument of confederation for sovereign States, are not the States federally and politically bound to conform their laws and institutions to the objects of the confederation as stated in the instrument?'

The States are 'federally and politically bound to conform their laws and institutions' to the positive provisions of the Federal Constitution, on all subjects for which power has been granted to the Federal Government; but they are under no obligations, federal or political, to conform any of their laws and institutions to the objects of the confederation, respecting which no power has been expressly granted, although such objects may be declared in the Constitution; all such are reserved for their own regulation. (11.)

7. 'Can sovereign States bind themselves by a constitution securing liberty to the people, and yet be free to enslave the people?'

Viewing this as a mere abstract question, having reference only to an imaginary government, I should simply answer, no. But the question does not apply to any State or nation that I know of. The sovereign States of this Union never bound themselves 'by a constitution securing liberty to the people.' (12.) I agree that no State is 'free' (that is, has a right,) 'to enslave the people;' it is an atrocious wrong in any State; but it is a wrong with which no other State, or confederation of States, has a right to interfere. (13.)

8. 'Ought not Federal Sovereignty to be regarded, as well as State Sovereignty?'

Certainly; each within their own limits respectively; neither to encroach on the other beyond those limits. (14.)

9. 'Is it not a prerogative of Federal Sovereignty to secure to the people the enjoyment of Federal privileges, such as the privilege of the post office, of the patent office, of commercial regulations?'

Unquestionably it is, and an exclusive prerogative too, for the powers for these purposes were expressly granted to the Federal Government, and not reserved by the States; had they not been thus granted, the Federal Government could not have used them. Most of these powers, however, may be considered as restrictions, rather than privileges for the people.

10. 'Can the Federal Government secure to the people Federal privileges without the power of securing their personal liberty?'

Certainly it can. To a man imprisoned under federal or State law, it can give the privilege of the post office to write to his distant friends, it might give to a slave a patent for an invention without emancipating him, and commercial privileges to a captive taken in war. (15.)

11. 'If a State Government reduces the people to Slavery, does it not deprive them of the privileges of Federal citizenship, and thus interfere with Federal Sovereignty?'

People that are enslaved are undoubtedly deprived of many of the privileges of Federal citizenship, and so are women, minors and convicts, and these generally by State laws, but whoever imagines that these restrictions are an interference with 'Federal Sovereignty?' The simple argument is, that Federal Sovereignty does not extend to these cases; neither does it to that of slaves. (16.)

12. 'Does not the doctrine of State Sovereignty, as applied against interference with State Slavery, rob Federal citizens of Federal protection, and leave them at the mercy of State despotism?'

The non-interference of the Federal Government with State Slavery, does not rob Federal citizens of Federal protection, as slaves never had the privileges of citizenship any more than Indians, aliens or minors. (17.) A State Government imprisoning a man for crime, deprives him of Federal protection; no federal government com-

plaints of the State for this. (18.) As to 'State despotism'—the comparison of it with 'Federal protection,' is almost ludicrous; the severest pressure of tyranny, that is felt by individual citizens, is that which comes from the exercises of the enormous powers granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution; perpetually increased by the encroachments of false judicial construction. (19.) If we should concede to the United States Government, the right to control the institution of Slavery in the States, it would be a pretence—and a very good one, to regulate, step by step, every other State institution, till every vestige of State independence would be absorbed, and though the forms of a Republic might be continued, our country would become a consolidated, autocratic empire, like that of the Cæsars or the Czar. (20.)

I trust I. S. will acknowledge that I have answered his questions fully, if not satisfactorily. J. P. B.

NOTES IN REPLY.

BY THE EDITOR.

(1.) And so the doctrine that the protection of personal liberty by the Federal General Government would be 'consolidation,' 'centralization,' 'usurpation,' and reduce our Republic to an 'autocratic Empire, like that of the Cæsars or the Czar'—is, at length, driven back for shelter to the fortress of its natural paternity, namely, that all Government is, and ever has been, a usurpation of power—that all submission to civil government and protecting law is 'servility or fear.'—The avowal is a consistent and honest one. But it strikes us as being better suited to please slaveholders than abolitionists. The grand question between them has been in respect to the sacredness of protecting law. Slavery is the absence of it. Abolition is its vitalized presence and power. If all Governments are usurpations, then State Governments are usurpations, and what means the clamor for 'State Sovereignty' and 'State Rights'? If it be usurpation for the National Government to protect the personal liberty of its citizens, then it would be usurpation for the State Governments to protect the personal liberties of their citizens! Well. This harmonizes, pretty well, with the Washington Union, which denies the Constitutional right of the States to exclude slaves and slavery.

(2.) This view of Government will be welcomed by the despotic, and by the haters of civil government, and restraining and protecting law. Can any others regard it with favor?

(3.) That is to say, the 'minor portion' of society have no right to establish 'an usurpation'—but if they do, they are 'morally bound, in justice' to administer that usurpation 'for the good of all'—to the extent of the power' with which the said 'minor portion' shall have seen fit to clothe themselves!—Very lucid! And very satisfactory, doubtless, to all 'minor portions' who usurp the authority, whether in Kansas, in Carolina, or at Washington City.—We see, in this, a specimen of the instructions concerning Constitutions and Governments, with which we are to be favored by the haters of them. Very kind in them, certainly. We are gaining wisdom, rapidly.

(4.) 'We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.'—*Preamble of the Constitution.*

Is there here no recognition of justice and

right? And do not these constitute 'the higher law'? If not, what do constitute it? What other 'Christian interpretation' could be given to them? What other are they, honestly, susceptible of?

(5.) If 'all governments, even the most tyrannical,' profess to administer justice, are they not bound by their professions? Is there 'no acknowledgment of any obligation whatever' in the fact of making and solemnly publishing such professions?

(6.) The Preamble does not say that justice and right, and securing the blessings of liberty were proposed merely 'in order to form a more perfect union' any more than it says that the latter was 'in order' to the former. It says that the *Constitution* was ordained and established 'in order' to the *whole* of the things specified.—But what if J. P. B.'s account of the matter were the correct one? Suppose they *did* promise to 'secure justice and secure the blessings of liberty'—'in order to form a more perfect Union'? Would there be nothing morally, legally, and Constitutionally binding in such a promise? Nothing that the Government, thus constituted, would be bound by the Constitution to fulfil and to secure? If not, what constitutions, compacts, or promises, can bind anybody? Would the promise have been less binding, because made to procure a supposed benefit?

(7.) This may be sound Constitutional exposition, good law, and wise and just axioms of Government, to those who believe in neither Constitution, Law, nor Government. But the friends of Constitutional Government and protecting law, will, of course, repudiate them. Constitutions are not legislative enactments, but they authorize such enactments, for all the objects, purposes, and designs for which Constitutions are ordained and established. Otherwise, Constitutions might as well be blank paper.

(8.) What have we here but an express repudiation of the "higher law"—the law of God, as a rule of governmental action, and a substitution of mere compacts in its stead? If the writer, by using the word "legally," means to admit a moral obligation that is not legal, then he recognizes a legality which is immoral. In this he expounds "legality" in opposition to the best writers on the science of law, who allow nothing to be legal that is not moral.

(9.) The "perplexity" of J. P. B. arises, probably, from his not recognizing the truth that the rightful or real authority of Government is derived from God—that "the powers (authorities) that be (that have a veritable existence) are ordained of God." This being the fact, it follows that if the Federal Government has no authority to administer justice, in conformity with God's law, then it has no authority at all. This was the sentiment conveyed in the fifth question of I. S., and it cannot be set aside.

(10.) In other words, governments and rulers are legally authorized to do whatever the States or the people have expressed in the Constitution, "right or wrong;" they are "legally" released from the obligation to obey God, who is the source of all government and law! Here, again, J. P. B. expounds political and legal

* We use the term "higher law," because we find it in the discussion, but do not mean to admit that there can be any valid human law that is against God's law—the only, ultimate, real law.

obligations in perfect harmony with the expositions of those who insist upon the legal obligation of obeying men rather than God. If such be J. P. B.'s theory of civil government, we do not wonder that he should repudiate it. We should do the same, if we believed in that theory. But then we should cease to expound Constitutions of Government, or political or legal obligations, or State "Sovereignty," "consolidation," and "State Rights." We should hand them all over to Satan and his viceregents, as the only authoritative expounders and legitimate administrators of them. We would have nothing to do with "dissolving the Union," for the purpose of building up another—a Northern Republic, to be controlled by the same authority and the same maxims.

(11.) This is a strange statement. If we understand it, it amounts to this: If a "Sovereign State" enters into an agreement of confederation with other States, it is not politically bound "to conform to the objects of the Confederation"—(not even "to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty")—unless the articles of agreement have "expressly granted power" to some federal government, to enforce upon the State, a compliance with the agreement. Carried into private or commercial life, the doctrine would be, that no man is under any legal obligations to conform his acts to his agreements, unless there be a power lodged somewhere, to compel him. And it will be seen, as we proceed, that J. P. B. would decidedly object against clothing the Federal Government with any such power.

(12.) If the reader will look back to the Preamble of the Constitution, as already quoted, he will find that it contradicts the statement of J. P. B. as flatly as human language can possibly make it do. What the Constitution and its adopters affirm, J. P. B. denies.

(13.) Has not a confederation of States, a right to interfere, if the articles of agreement between the States, expressly requires it to interfere? "The United States shall guaranty to every State in the Union, a Republican form of Government." In previous Notes on J. P. B.'s views, we have shown that this binds the Federal Government to suppress slavery in the States.

(14.) This is a concession that there are Constitutional limits or modifications of State Sovereignty and State Rights; and that there is a Constitutional obligation to conform to those restrictions. Compare this with what J. P. B. says in reply to the sixth question, as commented upon in our Note 11, and see how he agrees with himself. An examination of the Constitution will show that it grants no more or other powers to the Federal Government to restrict or restrain the States in anything, than it does in respect to violations of personal rights, which the Constitution prohibits to the States. If "State Sovereignty" is not limited there, it is limited no where else. When the Constitution says, "No State shall enter into any treaty or confederation, grant letters of marque and reprisal, coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but silver and gold coin a tender in payment of debts;" it confers no more power on the Federal Government to restrict the States in these particulars than it does, when in the very same paragraph it adds—or "pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility." If the Federal Government cannot limit State Sovereignty in these latter particulars (which forbid Slavery in the States) then it cannot limit State Sovereignty in the former particulars. And this would leave the Sovereign States unrestricted. The "power" has been expressly granted to Congress, to enforce all these restrictions, in the clause following:

"Congress shall have power" "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in

the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 18.

(15.) We suppose the question of I. S. has respect to "personal liberty," in distinction from chattelhood. And the Federal Government could not grant a slave the privilege of the Post Office, the Patent Office, or of commercial regulations, without investing him with the rights of humanity and denying his chattelhood. How could a slave, remaining such, be allowed the benefits of a patent for an invention, when he, himself, with all his earnings and possessions, remained the property of another? At this point, J. P. B. would find that his expositions of the Constitution would not, as at some other points, agree with those of the slaveholders.

(16.) Why should an anti-slavery man confound the legal condition of slaves with that of women, minors and convicts—as pro-slavery writers have so strangely done? Have women, minors and convicts no part nor lot in the protection afforded by the Constitution? If they have, and if, as J. P. B. insinuates, the condition of slaves is the same with theirs, then his argument proves that the Constitution protects slaves—which is the opposite of his doctrine, as exhibited in his answer to the next question. On the other hand, if slaves are not protected by the Constitution, then the writer's classing women, minors, &c., with slaves proves that these have no Federal protection, nor Federal rights—no right to sue in the Federal Courts, any more than Dred Scott—a considerable extension of Judge Taney's exposition.

(17.) The same confusion over again. But why are not slaves Federal citizens? Mr. Jefferson repeatedly calls them citizens. The Constitution does not exclude them, for it says nothing of slaves or of slavery, or of distinctions of color. If citizens of States, they would be Federal citizens, even by the concession of Judge Taney. If they were not regarded as being, legally, slaves, would they not have to be regarded and recognized as citizens, being of adult age, and native born? Undoubtedly they would, and J. P. B. cannot deny it without going with Judge Taney.

Well, there are, legally, no slaves in this country, and we shall cite J. P. B. himself, in proof of this. This discussion with him was occasioned by our having remarked in our Sept. No., page 16, a 'discrepancy' in those 'who readily admit the illegality of slavery and the impossibility of its being legalized, who are nevertheless stumbled at the idea that the Federal Government can suppress slavery in the States. They think it would infringe State Sovereignty, and interfere with State Rights.'

To this article J. P. B. responded in our paper, for Nov., in a communication headed 'NON SEQUITUR,' in which repeating our words above quoted, and speaking of our article, he said:

"It refers to a class of persons to which I belong." Still further he quoted us as having said:

"If Slavery be illegal, and if it cannot be legalized, then State Rights do not include the right of maintaining Slavery, and it is no part of State Sovereignty or of National Sovereignty, or of any other Sovereignty, to claim any such rights."

Having quoted this, J. P. B. added—"To this premise I agree,"—yet he proceeded, nevertheless, to argue, that a National suppression of Slavery would be an infringement of State Sovereignty, because it would be the inference a foreign power. To this argument of we appended notes. In our February number we published his rejoinder, and our further notes. In the meantime our correspondent I. S. in our January number, furnished the questions now repeated with J. P. B.'s reply. How well he has maintained his position, and whether he has consistently adhered to his conceded 'premise,' in respect to 'State Sovereignty,' the reader will judge. And now let us see whether he still continues to concede the illegality of Slavery? If those held in Slavery are not legally thus held, then, of course, they are legally citizens,

and J. P. B.'s assertion of the contrary, should be recalled, though it would upset the whole train of his argument, for he cannot deny that the Federal Government must protect its own citizens. This, he evidently perceives.

(18.) The imprisonment of a criminal, by a State Government, for crime, furnishes no parallel to the enslavement of an innocent man, under State authority. And besides, J. P. B. has maintained that State prisoners, and even a slave may receive Federal privileges; which involves the principle of Federal protection, yet here he denies it.

(19.) Let J. P. B. try the experiment, and see. Let him be subjected to 'State despotism,' for twenty-four hours, on a Georgia plantation, and see whether the 'enormous powers granted to the Federal Government,' even 'increased by the encroachments of false judicial decision,—as 'felt by individual citizens' can begin to compare with it. To judge correctly, we must remember them that are in bonds as bound with them. Another thing. If such 'enormous powers (are) granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution,' is it incredible that the needful and humane power of protection from chattelhood was also granted to it? And still further. If the courts should construe the powers of Government as J. P. B. construes them, would they not, naturally, be led to make the 'encroachments' which J. P. B. condemns as being the result of 'false constructions.'

(20.) Here, at length, we reach the bottom line. Like almost all others who have ventured to take his side of the discussion, he has got quite beyond the question what the Constitution is; and has gone into the discussion of what it ought to be. And like most others, on his side, he has concluded that the American people and the American Government ought not to suppress, (ought not to abolish) American Slavery! Ought not to claim and exercise the power of protecting all the people of the Nation from chattelhood! Ought not to "Execute Judgment between a man and his neighbor" nor "Deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor." "Ought not to 'Break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free,' nor 'Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof.'" No! This would be "destroying every vestige of State Independence." It would destroy the vitality, if not "the forms of a Republic." "Our country would virtually become a consolidated autocratic empire, like that of the Cæsars or the Czar."

Gov. M. Duffie was not far from the truth, then, when he declared that "Slavery is the Corner Stone of our Republican edifice." The Country and the world were startled at the enunciation of this doctrine, from the Slaveholding Governor of South Carolina, twenty-two years ago. But, in substance, it comes now from those claiming to be anti-slavery men. J. P. B. stands not alone, in this thing. Within the year or two past, nearly the same utterances have reached us, in the Editorials of at least four religious anti-slavery journals—the Oberlin Evangelist, the New York Independent, the New York American Baptist, and the Dover, (N. H.) Morning Star.

What does this mean? What does it portend? And by what instrumentality shall the Church and the Nation, at such a crisis be roused from such an astonishing delusion? Just as certainly as God lives and reigns, just as certainly as the Scriptures contain his pure word, just as certainly as past history is the exponent of his moral government over the nations, this nation must abolish slavery or be punished.

POSTSCRIPT.

We have received another short communication from J. P. B., which we had prepared to publish with a very few remarks of our own, but regret to find that we cannot now spare the room. It is proper to say that J. P. B. 'disallows' our views, after having read our February number.

Our readers, doubtless, understand that we do not attribute to J. P. B. any moral sympathy with Judge Taney and the Slavery party, though we have been compelled to show that their theories of the Constitution and of Government, are in many respects, the same and came to the same results.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, MARCH, 1858.

THE LINGERING CATASTROPHE.

The wheels of State—and of Time, move on tardily. Events that, under ordinary circumstances, would be startling, are now noted and pondered in silence. All eyes are intent upon watching for the closing scene of the drama of Kansas—and for the opening of that still greater drama, yet unnamed.

Will the Lecompton outrage be successfully driven through Congress? through both Houses? Will the REPRESENTATIVES be overborne? That is the question on all lips, the one which no man can, with absolute certainty, answer. 'It looks like it'—is a common response, among meditative men.

Yes. *It looks like it.* There seems little or nothing to hinder. Two or three more votes to be bargained for—two or three more offices to be judiciously distributed, or two or three hundred thousand dollars to be slipped into the right pockets—pockets already prepared for it, and the question is settled. It may be a matter of some delicacy to select the recipients of these favors to the best advantage, the most economically, the most prudently, and so as not to hazard the danger that some disappointed expectant will maliciously ferret out his successful rival, and bring the matter before an investigating Committee. To preclude all clamors, it may be necessary to buy the silence of half a dozen others. They understand, at Washington, how these things may be done, so long as spare funds and vacant offices can be found. So long as nominations are made, and votes given on the maxim of 'availability' instead of principle, so long there will be members of Congress enough whose votes may be purchased. With political managers, this is doubtless one of the recommendations and definitions of the maxim. 'Political compromise' and political corruption are only two phases, or rather two names, of the same thing. No man in office is to be accounted incorruptible, who will compromise moral principle to get office, or to help his party, hold his principles in abeyance, or tell you that he is with you in principle and sympathy, while he deems it politic to act, for the time being, in opposition to that principle. This may seem severe. But it is truth. And it is attested by the notorious corruption and bribery now rampant in Congress and in many of the State Legislatures. Forty or fifty years ago, a politician or journalist, of either party, Republican or Federalist, that should have been convicted of uttering the dishonest maxims now openly promulgated and gloried in, even among professed reformers and friends of freedom, would have been driven out of honorable society and into oblivion. We speak of the things we know. And this needs to be understood, in order to estimate, correctly, the perils of Kansas and of the country. *There is a dearth of honest men.* And with few exceptions the suspicion of a man's honesty, now stamps him as an 'impracticable,' and destroys his 'availability' as a candidate. This it is, at least, with the party managers. And what party is not controlled by them? Here is something for the people to see to, if they would not lose their liberties. Aside from this CORRUPTION IN CONGRESS, thus fostered and thus maintained, there would have been no more danger of their passing the Lecompton swindle, than of their voting to make Buchanan emperor for life. The one would have been no more feasible than the other. We are not writing an essay, but only recording facts—facts necessary to be recorded in order to a right understanding of the daily transactions in Congress, Corruption—rank corruption rules and riots there.

Not to see that fact is not to see *any* thing done there, as it really exists. With this key it is easy to unlock mysteries otherwise inexplicable. When great men betray the sacred interests intrusted to them, it is not by mere accident or inadvertence. Poor creatures! They have 'prejudices to conquer'—their own or their constituent's; and it is not to be done without struggles, nor without the aid of substantial reasons and considerations, 'them thereunto moving.' Men are not mere machines. They must have motives. And the Washington Market is flooded with them, 'in lots to suit purchasers.' The seat of government is a great fish pond. Some are fishing for the Presidency, some for diplomatic appointments, some for subordinate stations, some for the solid gold, or the convertible rag scrip of some sort. Not every fisherman gets his coveted fish, but every 'available' and conceivable fish finds its fisherman. Commerce is the exchange of 'available' commodities. If every man has not his price, every 'available' man is expected to have. In a country wherein man is a chattel, and has his price, why should not men place a price upon themselves? If the sale of one's neighbor be not *malum en se*, if it be a Bible institution—who shall condemn the selling of one's self? If the one be Constitutional, how can the Constitution be violated by the other? Assuredly, it cannot be worse, or more unlawful to pocket the price of one's own soul and body, than forcibly to pocket the price of another man's.

The anticipated catastrophe, as we said, still lingers. If any one wishes to learn the present state of the question, we will refer him to the N. Y. Times, a Fremont Journal of 1856, a Buchanan Journal of 1857 (believing him to be on the same platform with Fremont,) and a Douglass Journal of 1858. The Richmond Whig had undertaken to tell the reason why the South insisted upon a Congressional endorsement of Lecompton. It was not in order to make Kansas a Slave State, for that was impossible. It was only to establish a principle—the principle of the 'naked, absolute, unconditional right to the admission into the Union of a Slave State, whenever such States, with regularly ordained Constitutions, shall present themselves at the door of Congress, and apply for admission.' To which the N. Y. Times, (March 9,) responds—

"If, then, that is the cause of the South's struggle, it might have spared itself an unnecessary conflict. The people of the Free States will never oppose the admission of new Slave States, when such States come with 'fair and regularly-ordained Constitutions.' Of this, the South may rest constantly assured. Had the Slavery Constitution now urged upon Kansas been adopted by a majority of the people, upon a fair and regular vote, the North would make no opposition. Let us not be cited to the Abolition Party. It is insignificant in numbers, impracticable in spirit, and must always be without influence in national politics. We speak not for that powerless band of fanatics. But we repeat that the North will treat with fairness and liberality any new state which may hereafter present itself with a Slavery Constitution, adopted without fraud, and with the approval of a popular majority."

"And should Slave States be carved out of Texas, as by the treaty of annexation, there may be, let not the Richmond Whig fear that their admission will be retarded because a majority of the people may have preferred that Slavery should exist therein."

"It should be understood at the South, as it will not be controverted at the North, that the Free States have no objection to 'popular sovereignty' in the Territories, even though it should result in the establishment of Slavery, provided such sovereignty be real and not spurious—the fairly-expressed will of the majority, and not the hideous offspring of trickery and violence."

This, we know, is in perfect keeping with the Douglass platform. Thus far for the testimony and the influence of the New York Times.

The N. Y. Tribune, as our readers will remember, (see our paper for January) declared that the leading Republicans and Senator Douglass had had 'a full and frank conference,' and 'the results were mutually satisfactory.' The Tribune also said—

'The Nebraska struggle never hinged upon the right of a Slave holding and Slavery loving Territory, to come into the Union as a Slave State. What the Republicans wanted was *not* to keep a State out of the Union on account of Slavery, but to keep Slavery out of each embryo State.'

Thus explicitly does the Tribune repudiate the platform of 'No more Slave States'—and even denies that either the opponents of the Nebraska bill or the Republicans ever rallied upon that platform. And recently the Tribune has advised Republicans in Illinois and elsewhere, to go in for the support, at the polls, of Senator Douglass and his Democratic associates.

We have also quoted in our January number from the National Era, a denial of any Constitutional power of Congress to exclude Slavery from the Territories. Add to this, the course of Senators Seward and Wilson, in supporting the Administration's Army bill, at the very moment when that army is employed to crush out freedom in Kansas, with the threat of Jefferson Davis and others, that this same force is to be employed to keep the 'State of Kansas' in subjection after its admission, the President declaring in his Message that no Constitution or legislation, can 'confiscate' the slaves already in Kansas—putting all these things together, we say, it may be conjectured what are the prospects that the House (the Senate being committed to the Administration,) will preserve its apparent majority of one to three votes against the Lecompton swindle.

Where long professed principles can be given up with such celerity, and even the former profession of them boldly denied, what probability is there that not so many as one, two, or three more members of the House will relinquish their professed principles likewise? If all who adhere to principle are to be derided as 'impracticables'—and laid aside as 'unavailable,' what reason have we to think that a majority of the House will hazard the odium of being thus 'impracticable' and 'unavailable?' If principle can be yielded to policy, once, twice, or thrice, what shall prevent the yielding of it, for the fourth time?

It will be said that all this compromise of principle was under the belief that the good of the country required it. Exactly so. And hence the probability that the same thing, and on the same plea, will be done again. Besides; if statesmen are to be educated to the policy, and on the ethics of compromising moral principle for the supposed benefit of their country, what reason is there to expect that they will not compromise moral principle, for their own apparent personal advantage. Men are not trained to gross bribery at once, any more than they are to beastly drunkenness. These must always be a first taste, and then the increased appetite, and the progression. All compromise of moral principle for the sake of advantage, is of the nature of a bribe, whether the supposed good of the nation or of an individual, be the price of the defection. Even old heathen Athens in her best days, had Senators noble enough to spurn the proffered bribe of benefitting their country, by an act violating moral principle. When professed Christian Statesmanship and ethics fall so far below this, as is now witnessed, what barrier against unblushing venality and unbounded corruption remains? The stream is poisoned at its fountain.

Among the baits held out to catch the votes of hesitant yet itching members, of the House for the Lecompton swindle, is the pretence, by President Buchanan and others, that the hated Constitution can be amended, prior to its own prescribed date of 1864. To a man of principle—an 'impracticable,' such a bait would be an insult—intimating that he were a Judas, who, for a price, could betray an innocent man, hoping that his miraculous powers would shield him from seizure, or enable him to come down from the cross. But to a Balaam, loving the wages of unrighteousness, and willing, for the sake of it, to pronounce an impotent curse which he foresaw would not prevent a subsequent blessing, such a bait must be quite a tempting one. It could be plausibly de-

fended on the maxims now current in almost all political circles. In principle, it would be no worse than that of promising to let Slavery alone in the States, in order to help Kansas, while professing, in other circles, and among abolitionists, that the pledge was insincere, and only made to carry a present object, and gain time. Mr. Keitt, we perceive, has endangered the bait, by dissenting from Mr. Buchanan, and declaring that the Kansas Lecompton Constitution, cannot be amended until 1864. Let us see what northern members will vote for it, after this.

The *Richmond Whig's* declaration that the enforcement of the Lecompton swindle is not so much in the hope of making Kansas a Slave State, as it is in order to establish a principle, deserves study. It is, thus far, probably true. But we do not believe that the principle designed to be established, is merely the admissibility of new Slave States. The *Times* is correct in saying that, by all except earnest abolitionists, that point is conceded already. And besides, the Lecompton struggle does not involve that point. The 'principle' and the precedent really meant to be established is, that no State has a right to exclude Slavery, and that Congress, under the Constitution, is bound to protect slave holding, in all the States. This is plainly the doctrine of the President's Lecompton Message, as it is also of the President's organ, the Union. This, then, is the almost enacted catastrophe that yet lingers!

HOW THE NATION IS BEING RUINED—NEW AGGRESSIONS MET BY NEW COMPROMISES.

One would think that a continued series of successful pro-slavery aggressions would teach the victims of them to repudiate the policy of compromise. As yet, however, it is notorious that the very opposite effect has been produced by them.

1. The introduction of slavery into Missouri Territory was an aggression; and it led to the Missouri Compromise.
2. The annexation of Texas, and the consequent war with Mexico, was an aggression; and it induced Liberty party men to compromise away their demand for the abolition of slavery in the Federal District, and of the inter-state slave trade, for the sake of gaining additional recruits to sustain the principle of the Wilmot proviso.
3. The refusal to admit California as a free State was an outrageous attempt at aggression. But it accomplished its main object, the so-called "compromise measures" of 1850, which fastened upon us the Fugitive Slave Bill.
4. The passage of that Fugitive Slave Bill was, itself, a most daring aggression; but the rivet that fastened it upon us was the pretence of its being a compromise.
5. The repeal of the Missouri restriction, by passing the Kansas Nebraska Bill, was the next daring aggression. This produced a new compromise, in which opposition to the Fugitive Slave Bill was given up, and the issue of "No more slave States" abandoned, in order to gain additional help in restoring the Missouri restriction, and thus excluding slavery from Kansas.
6. The violent and fraudulent seizure of the Kansas ballot box, by Missourian invaders, sustained by Federal troops, with the attempt to force the pro-slavery Lecompton Constitution upon Kansas, was the next audacious aggression. Already it is producing a new compromise in which the principle of the Federal exclusion of slavery from the Territories is in process of being given up, and exchanged for the principle of the Douglas Kansas Nebraska Bill, the principle of "Squatter Sovereignty," in order to gain additional help, from Douglas and

company, in preventing the forcible imposition of the Lecompton Constitution upon Kansas.

We have here enumerated six successive aggressions of the slave power, every one of which has been successful, except the attempted exclusion of California as a free State, and the attempt to force slavery upon Kansas, which is still undetermined.

And, in each instance, a compromise, a concession, a precedent, an admission of a principle, has been yielded to slavery, of greater benefit to it than the particular measure in controversy.

The Missouri compromise not only made Missouri a slave State, but established the precedent of admitting slave States, and of making pro-slavery compromises, giving rise and plausibility to the modern pretence, before unheard, that a similar compromise had been made in forming the constitution itself!

The annexation of Texas was a triumph of less direct importance to the slave power than was the consequent compromise, by which the platform of the Liberty party was exchanged for the truly "impracticable" platform of "No more slave States"—an exchange which changed the position of Freedom from the aggressive to the defensive, and enabled Slavery to spare herself the labor of acting longer on the defensive, and bend all her forces to the aggressive.

The admission of California, under her own constitution, as a free State, was entitled to have been regarded a matter of course, and would have been but for the fatal precedent of previous compromises. The slave power, by setting up an aggressive opposition, gained nothing directly on that point. But indirectly, it gained the so-called "Compromise measures" of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave Bill, with the concession that free States were to be admitted only by yielding equivalents.

And by the Fugitive Slave Bill, it gained less, directly, in a way of reclaiming fugitive slaves, than it did by the implied concession of the constitutionality of slavery, the legal right of slave property, and the duty of the Federal Government to protect that species of property even in the free States. This laid a foundation for what has followed.

In passing the Kansas Nebraska Bill, the slave power gained less, directly, in carrying slavery into Kansas, (even if it be made a slave State,) than it gained by the consequent compromise entered into by its opponents, in which they yielded up their previous demand of "No more slave States."

The Lecompton swindle, if it shall be carried in Congress, will be but a sorry triumph in itself, for the slave power, so far as Kansas itself is concerned. Even if it could be made, by force and fraud, a slave State, and kept in that condition, that triumph, alone, would not repay the expenditure. The slave power is, in this process, gaining her chief advantage in the compromise which is growing out of it, by which the claim of Federal power to exclude slavery from Territories and new States is already being relinquished in favor of the Douglas "Squatter Sovereignty" platform, so recently and so earnestly contended against; and, finally, by establishing the principle that "the Constitution carries slavery into the Territories and new States," that the States cannot "confiscate"

slave property, and that the Federal Government is bound to protect that property in all the States.

And, if the Lecompton measure shall now have been carried, it will more than have compensated for the cost of the experiment, by the "compromise," and change of policy imposed upon the friends of freedom, as already mentioned.

Whether successful or unsuccessful in a particular aggression, the slave power always gains a "compromise," a concession, by every new attempt at aggression, and must continue to do so until its opponents learn better than to make any compromises, or to lower down any of the just claims. It is the compromise, rather than the aggression giving rise to it, that inflicts upon freedom the chief injury.

Had there been no Missouri compromise there would have been no slaves in Missouri. Her slavery would have been abandoned. The "compromise" policy would never have been inaugurated; nor other slave States admitted; nor "the compromises of the Constitution" ever heard of, nor any "Missouri restriction" to be disputed about or repealed, or border Ruffian invasions of Kansas, or Federal troops, or Lecompton constitutions, employed to sustain them.

Had the friends of freedom never compromised away their Liberty party platform in exchange for the platform of "No more slave States," they would have numbered in 1852, on their original platform, (as Gov. Chase has admitted,) more than the number of their votes thrown for Van Buren. At the present time we should doubtless have had a Radical Abolition party, stronger than the one now preparing to occupy the Douglas Squatter Sovereignty platform.

Had there been no "compromise" to conciliate the opposers of free California, we should have had free California without the Fugitive Slave Bill.

Had no compromise given us the Fugitive Slave Bill, we should have had none of the aggressions or compromises that have followed. At every step, a new aggression gives us a new compromise, and every new compromise facilitates another new aggression, and another compromise, and so on.

So it must needs be in the future, if the policy is pursued, until the point is reached from whence it will be impossible to descend lower. The compromise now going on, by bringing the friends of freedom down to the Douglas platform, will bring them to the point from which a descent to the present Lecompton platform will become almost inevitable, the next time a new aggression shall tempt to a new compromise. It is to gain numbers and influence from Douglas Democrats that the present compromise is enacting. A similar movement will be probably witnessed whenever comes a fresh aggression of demanding the opening of the African slave trade. There will, doubtless be some supporters of the Lecompton constitution, who will offer to come into a party for opposing the African slave trade, provided a platform can be erected for their accommodation by assenting to, or (what is the same thing) omitting to oppose the Lecompton movement. The *Tribune*, if true to its maxims, must rep-

diate "the re-opening of by-gone issues." The rally will be on the single question of opening the African slave trade. When that shall have been carried, as it probably would be, the next aggression, (if it be called another,) would be the Federal protection of slave holding in all the States. The Supreme Court would take care of that. Or, if the question should come before Congress, how many of the supporters of the African Slave Trade could the *Compromisers* find to go with them? And with what chance of success?

The great, perpetual error is that of trying to stave off, one by one, particular measures of pro-slavery aggression without striking directly and effectually at the source of them all: depending upon mere temporary, fluctuating, and inadequate EXPEDIENTS, instead of being guided by PRINCIPLE; of laboring to prevent the vital functions of slavery, its pulsations, its respirations, its manifestations of life, while tolerating and permitting its existence.

During the whole *thirty eight years* in which this series of aggressions and corresponding compromises have been going on, acting and reacting upon each other, mutually, as cause and effect, there have been a few who have uniformly protested against the policy as well as the principle of compromise, and who have steadily predicted the series of results that have been witnessed. They have been derided as "visionaries, fanatics, and impracticables"—as others, of ancient times, bearing similar testimonies, have been, before them. But the results, at every step, have borne testimony to the soundness of their philosophy, and the sagacity of their anticipations. The final consummation and close of this policy is evidently at hand, for there is little left to be compromised. And, whether the Republic is to be wrecked by adhering to it a little longer, or rescued by its prompt and speedy abandonment, *history*, as read by posterity, will vindicate the course of those who have devoted their energies to the thankless task of opposing it; and will transmit their warnings for the benefit of other generations.

HOW THE NATION MIGHT YET BE RESCUED FROM THE LECOMPTON INIQUITY.

There is, manifestly, one way: and, so far as we can now perceive, there is but one way, in which the friends of freedom in Congress can crush out the Lecompton iniquity, and thus rescue the nation.

Six or eight men in the Senate and twenty or thirty in the House of Representatives, could put an end to the project of villiany in twenty-four hours, if they had the requisite sagacity and courage, and would stand shoulder to shoulder with decision and firmness, understanding each other, beforehand.

Duly prepared, let a simultaneous motion be made, on the same day, and, if practicable, at the same time of the day, or as nearly as may be, in both houses. Let the motion be to introduce a Bill for the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery in all the States, under authority of Congress. Let the motion in each House be eagerly seconded by a number of earnest voices at the same instant, and let the Senator or Representative who thus gets the floor, proceed in good earnest, to urge and defend the proposed measure, as essential to the preservation of our liberties and the continuance of our Republic. Or, if, from the precedence of other business already on hand, such a motion would not be in order, let the sentiment be brought distinctly forward and made prominent, in speeches against the Lecompton swindle. At the

close of such a speech, the measure might, perhaps, be proposed, or notice given of an intention of bringing it forward at the earliest opportunity. In either case, make it to be seen and felt that the movement is made, or will be made, in good earnest, that it is no sham or pretence gotten up for effect, but the deliberate and settled conviction and determination of the movers.

Let it be known that there are six or eight men in the Senate, and twenty or thirty in the House, who are ripe for this movement, and the Slave Power would receive a shock, in the capitol, never before witnessed. The fingers of a man's hand, on the inner walls of the White House, would be seen writing characters that would need no interpreter. The knees of the Belshazzar residing there, would be seen smiting together, his thousand lords would find the cup of astonishment at their lips, their two-leaved gates wide open, and the channel of their river bare, under their citadel.

Such a movement would wither up the strength of every slaveocrat, south of Mason & Dixon's line, the very instant in which the telegraph wires brought the intelligence of it. The same magic wires would electrify four millions of slaves and free people of color, at the South, and nearly six millions of non-slaveholding whites. There would then be a South, in the presence of which the less than two hundred thousand slaveholders would be as a handful of grass-hoppers. The same wires would electrify fifteen millions of Northern freemen, and convey the bolt of annihilation to the serviles of the Custom House, of the Post Office, of the pulpit, and of the caucus. There would then be a NORTH as well as a South—an upper and a nether mill stone, between which the Slave Power would be speedily ground to powder.

Does any one doubt this? Will any reflecting mind dismiss the idea as visionary? Or will it be said that we are dealing only in flourishes of rhetoric?

Think again, and think soberly. What is it that sustains the Lecompton villiany? What is it that renders the slaveholders' claim to the Federal protection of his property in Kansas or elsewhere, plausible? What is it, or what can it be, but the belief that there is, legally, and Constitutionally, property in man? Take away that belief, and what possibility remains of sustaining any such claim?

On the other hand, what possibility is there that the slaveholder's Lecompton claim can be quashed or set aside, so long as the belief in the validity of his claim to slave property, continues? or, so long as it is not denied, resisted, and assailed, but is, on the contrary, conceded and admitted, even by the anti-Lecompton members of Congress? To what less does the concession, from that quarter, amount, than a plea of "guilty" to the charge of designing to plunder the slaveholders of their property?

Consider, still farther, that every slaveholder of common sense and common intelligence, is intuitively conscious, (whatever pretensions he may make) that his claim of property in man is a most flagitious and self-condemnatory one—that however impudently he may press that claim, and its consequents, upon those by whom it is ignorantly or hypocritically conceded, he must find himself shorn of his strength, whenever the validity of his claim is honestly and intelligently contested.

Nothing can be more certain than that the claims of the slaveholders must be conceded, to the widest possible or conceivable extent to which the claim to property can be urged; or else the infamous claim to human chattels must be equitably branded as infamous, and the seal of the nation's reprobation and prohibition stamped upon it. In the one case, the nation concedes its own fitness to be fettered; in the other case, it breaks the fetter, and is self-emancipated.

FOOLISH SELF-CONFIDENCE.

Thirty eight years ago—we can remember it as if it were but yesterday—the attempted admission of Missouri as a slave State, was regarded, at the North, an impossibility. The

northern Senators and Representatives in Congress seemed to stand firm. Eloquent speeches were made. Letters from Washington assured us that there was no danger of its passing. The compromise was, at length, proposed. In and out of Congress, it was resolutely spurned. Administration men, of high standing, joined forces with the opposition. Henry Clay himself, the author of the compromise, on a Saturday evening, almost despaired, but resolved to try the effects of a Sunday dinner upon some of the impracticables. By dint of alternate flattery and intimidation, he succeeded in changing a few votes. The threat of dissolving the Union, at length turned the scale, and the six or seven apostates were dubbed "dough faces" by John Randolph for their pains—thus coining the phrase still in use.

Time rolled on. The hated compromise, first submitted to, then endured, then claimed as a protection, was relied upon to protect from slavery the territory north of 36° 30'! Vain confidence!

When the annexation of Texas was first proposed, and for a long time afterwards, the possibility of its accomplishment was not believed. At several stages of the contest, it was confidently said that the measure was defeated. At length, as a last resort, it was carried by joint Resolution of both houses.

The passage of the Wilmot proviso, excluding slavery from the conquered provinces of Mexico, was confidently anticipated and predicted. The Restriction was carried through the House of Representatives, and seemed to fail only because the session closed before it could reach the Senate. At the next session, it was again passed, but was rejected in the Senate, and the House finally concurred.

The so called "Omnibus Bill" embracing the Fugitive Slave bill, sustained a signal defeat in that shape, and great rejoicings were held. But in separate bills, the measures were at length carried.

The Kansas Nebraska bill, at its first appearance, was laughed at, as a blunder, and jests were cracked upon its author. It succeeded, nevertheless.

No measure was ever more confidently urged than that of excluding new slave States, but the measure, upon the passage of the Kansas Nebraska bill, was abandoned.

The enterprise of restoring the Missouri Compromise, was, at first, entered upon, with the greatest confidence. But that, too, is now numbered among the efforts that have been.

The measure of excluding slavery from new Territories, was a favorite and apparently a promising one. But it shared the fate of the proposed exclusion of new slave States.

Next came the hope and the promise of 'freedom for Kansas,' on the basis of its having been 'once consecrated to freedom,' but that, too, went by the board, along with the attempt to restore the Missouri restriction.

Finally, we have on hand, the task of defeating the Lecompton swindle, and the forcible extension of slavery into Kansas, by the Federal arms. Of all the enterprises to cripple and limit the slave power, while permitting its existence, this, the last, the most audacious one, has been the least hopeful—and yet its success at several of its stages, has been confidently heralded. But where are we now?

Such a series of disappointments should somewhat temper the confidence of those who have so constantly promised us exemption from the

natural effects of our great national sin, without repenting of it, and putting it far away from us.

Very evidently God has a controversy with us. He favors none of our wise expedients to shelter ourselves from his chastisements, while proudly disclaiming any intention of obeying his commandment to break every yoke, and deliver the spoiled.

DISSOLUTION—THE BRADFORD CONVENTION—MR. PILLSBURY.

In Parker Pillsbury's account of the Bradford (Vt.) Convention, for the most part a pretty fair one, (in the *Liberator* and *Standard*) there occurs a passage which may call for a little notice, at our hands. It is as follows—

Mr. Goodell and Gov. Fletcher both spoke with great force and earnestness against dissolution. Mr. Goodell* for the hundredth time, perhaps, urged his most false, as well as ridiculous, argument, that we have no moral right to dissolve the Union, because it would cut us off from the slaves, and prevent our ever acting any more for their deliverance, thus leaving them, as he said, forever and hopelessly in the power of their masters. While he was urging so absurd a doctrine, it was hard indeed to have faith in his sincerity—nothing else in the whole Convention seemed so much like unfairness as that.

Mr. Pillsbury occupied two full hours in speaking, after we had closed, but made no attempt, that we remember, to show that our argument, was either 'false' or 'ridiculous'—'absurd,' 'unfair' or 'inconsistent with 'sincerity.' Neither has he since attempted the task, in the *Liberator* or *Standard*.

And why is William Goodell singled out, as the object of rebuke and of suspected sincerity, for this sentiment, any more than Theodore Parker and Samuel J. May, both of whom are still, we believe, in good and regular standing with Mr. Pillsbury and his associates, without a word of rebuke, or a taint of suspicion, or a charge of falsehood, absurdity, ridiculousness, insincerity, or unfairness?

At the Worcester Disunion Convention, a letter from Theodore Parker was read, and it was afterwards published, in which he said—

"I don't think it quite right for the powerful North, to back out of the Union, and leave four millions † of poor whites, and the four millions of slaves to their present condition, with the ghastly consequences, which are sure to follow.—No, sir." "We must bring the mixed multitude even out of the inner house of bondage &c."

Rev. S. J. May of the Garrison A. S. Convention in Rochester said—

He "was not prepared to go with Mr. Garrison for an immediate dissolution of the Union, not because he had any great reverence for it, but because he thought that slavery could be abolished more summarily, under the Constitution, susceptible as it is, of an anti-slavery construction, than by attempting to bring the people up to the dissolution standard. He was not at all certain that a dissolution of the Union would be the end of slavery."

Now, wherein do these sentiments of Messrs. Parker and May differ from mine?

Next, contrast these sentiments with those of Wendell Phillips' speech at the Worcester convention before mentioned.

"Dissolution of the Union gets rid of slavery."—"I have no love for insurrections, but 'hands off' is a good Saxon motto. Let the two races fight it out."

Was not this proposing to leave the slaves "in the power of their masters?" With Mr. Parker, we say we 'don't think it quite right.' It would not be manifesting proper sympathy for the slaves, nor loving our neighbor as ourselves. If Mr. Pillsbury thinks this 'most false,' 'ridiculous,' 'absurd,' 'unfair,' or 'inconsistent with the appearance of 'sincerity,' let him show how, why, and wherein it is so.

One of the most plausible objections urged against anti-slavery agitation at the North is, that the South is, to us, a foreign nation, in respect to slavery, and that we have no political power or responsibility in the premises. By a dissolution of the Union, would not the South become, to us, in reality, a foreign nation? And would not the objection thus be strengthened?

*This was at first, by mistake, ascribed to Gov. Fletcher, but was corrected afterwards.

†Nearer six millions.—ED. R. A

SPEECH OF MR. LOVEJOY.—We are indebted to Hon. Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, for a copy of his speech in the House of Representatives, Feb. 17, which is appropriately headed, "Human beings not property." It is a bold, manly utterance, well becoming a surviving brother of the great martyr. The speech begins with a denial that this is "a conflict between the North and the South." It is a question between freedom and slavery, between liberty and despotism. "The source of the strife" is "the existence of slavery itself." Alluding to the President's declaration that human beings are property in the absolute and unqualified sense, Mr. L. gives it a flat denial, affirming that "it has not the sanction of natural or revealed religion, or of the Constitution." On the religious and scripture argument, Mr. L. does honor to his former vocation of a Minister of the Gospel. We have room only for a short specimen:

"Eighteen centuries ago, appeared the most wonderful personage that has ever moved among men;—the God man, the Deity manifested in human form. After a life of chosen poverty, passed amid the poor and the lowly, he laid down his life to expiate the sins of man. President Buchanan, believest thou the Gospel record? I know that thou believest! Tell me, then, sir, did Christ shed his blood for cattle? Did he lay down his life to replevin personal property, to redeem real estate? I tell you, gentlemen, that this property claim in man is impiety, rank and foul, against God and His Anointed."

This is absolutely overwhelming. On the Declaration of Independence, too, he bases a powerful appeal. We detect some mistakes, as where the speaker apparently concedes, (what he might have denied and disproved by history, and by the highest Southern testimony,) that local municipal laws had created the relation. So, too, instead of conceding that slavery is "beyond the reach of the delegated powers of the Constitution," he might have affirmed and demonstrated the contrary. These errors, we trust, he will yet learn to correct. If we mistake not, Mr. Lovejoy has, in this speech, made encouraging progress from his former position—a refreshing spectacle in these times of retreat and declension.

SPEECH OF WM. H. SEWARD.—We have been reading the elaborate speech of Mr. Seward in the Senate, March 3rd. We have given it the more careful attention, as it has been said that it would make ample amends for the chagrin of his Republican and Anti-slavery friends, at his proffered support of the Army Bill. We have not seen how *any* speech could compensate for such an act, if consummated. We find nothing in this speech to change that view, but much to confirm it. As a historical review of the action of the Federal Government from the beginning, and especially of its action respecting Kansas, the speech has great merit, and permanent value. It proves the President to have been most perfidious, fraudulent, base, unscrupulous, and untrustworthy. No Senator or Representative who, after reading this speech, could vote to put another soldier or another bayonet into the President's hands, should, himself, be regarded as trustworthy. Mr. Seward says, distinctly, that if the Lecompton Constitution is attempted to be forced upon Kansas—as he proves the President is aiming to do—"there will be civil war." He adds—

"Will the people listen to your voice amid the thunders of your cannon! Let but one drop of the blood of a free citizen, be shed there by the Federal army, and the countenance of every representative of a free State, in

either House of Congress will blanch, and his tongue will refuse to utter the vote necessary to sustain the army in the butchery of his fellow citizens."

Why, then, with the knowledge of the doings and designs of the President, which this speech describes, should Mr. Seward vote, beforehand, supply the President with "cannon?" Mr. Seward had said, in reply to Mr. Hale, (who had criticised his Army speech,) "*I regard this battle as already fought. It is over.*" This speech of March 3rd tells another story. The Senator puts forth his strong appeals, and yet apprehends "civil war." On other points the Senator seems inconsistent. He willingly consents to "co-operate with Mr. Douglas, and his associates, on the ground of popular sovereignty;" yet afterwards *seems* disposed, though he does not exactly say it, to raise again the flag of "No more slavery extension." In one paragraph, he almost or quite affirms the illegality and unconstitutionality of slavery. (which he well understands,) but constructs his arguments and appeals on a much narrower basis. In the outset, he had spoken of what the question involves, "independently of its moral and humane elements;" and he seems to have shaped his speech "independently" of them.—"*White men, white races, white labor,*" seem to have covered the whole field of his vision.

OPENING OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

The New Orleans *Delta* triumphantly announces that the African slave trade is already opened in Mississippi, and that a regular depot has been opened on Pearl River, where cargoes of slaves are publicly landed and sold. This will not surprise intelligent abolitionists, who know that slaves have been, all along, smuggled into the Gulf States. The new movement is in open defiance of the laws of the United States. Colonizationists have gained public favor, and have collected hundreds of thousands of dollars on the credit of doing great things to stop the African slave trade. Let us see what, or how much, they will now say or do in opposition to this new demand of the slaveholders.

"OLD HESY" is the title of a new work, by Mrs. C. W. Denison, about to be issued by A. B. BURDICK, 8 Spruce street, New York. It is said to "treat of some of the domestic features of slavery, not dwelt upon by any other writer." From a few pages of the proof sheets furnished us, we should think it would prove a very readable and interesting volume.

BIBLE VINDICATED: A series of essays on American Slavery, with an Appendix. By Elder James Hartzel, Pastor of the First Christian Church, Davenport, Iowa. Cincinnati: published by John Boggs, 1858, pp. 128.

We have not yet had time to read thoroughly this new book, but from a glance at its pages and its table of contents, we have no doubt that it will be found a very useful work for the purpose for which it was designed. Indeed, like most works of that class, though taking the shape of a defence of the Bible, it evidently does more than it promises. It brings the Bible to bear directly against that system of abominations. This is inevitable, because there can be no neutrality on such a subject. The Bible must be either for it or against it, and in disproving the former, we naturally prove the latter. The very passages cited in its favor, cannot be correctly expounded, without showing them to be against.